

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present U.S. Patent application. Claims 15, 16 and 18-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Claims 1-14 and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Claims 1-3, 6, 7, 11, 12, and 14-18 have been amended. Claims 4 and 9 have been canceled. No claims have been added. Therefore, by this amendment, claims 1-3, 5-8 and 10-20 are pending.

Claim Objections

Claim 2 was objected to because of certain informalities. Claim 2 has been amended to overcome said informalities. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that said claim objection has been overcome. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the objection to claim 2.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102Rejections of Claims 15, 16 and 18-20 Based on *Kageyama*

Claims 15, 16 and 18-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,303,336 issued to Kageyama et al. (*Kageyama*). For at least the reasons set forth below, Applicant submits that claims 15, 16 and 18-20 are not anticipated by *Kageyama*.

Amended claim 15 recites the following:

a detector to detect from information in incoming blocks of data one or more formats in which it is desired to display said blocks;

a plurality of formatters to format the incoming blocks of data into the one or more formats, each of the formatters interfacing with the detector using a standard interface; ...

Amended claim 18 is a system claim, and recites similar limitations.

*Kageyama* discloses a printing system in which a plurality of terminals create document data composed of a combination of a printing protocol identifier and printing commands described by the printing protocol. See col. 5, line 66 – col. 6, line 2; col. 7, lines 13-16. The document data is transmitted to a print server, where a command processing part uses the protocol identifier to identify the printing protocol and selects a command processing program corresponding to the printing protocol. See col. 6, lines 3-4 and lines 29-42.

The command processing program interprets and executes the printing commands to obtain printing data, which is sent to a printer buffer and used to print a document. See col. 6, lines 43-50. The print server may be equipped with the command processing program that executes the printing commands to obtain the printing data. See col. 8, lines 3-10. Alternatively, the print server may be equipped with a command conversion program to convert the printing commands to common commands, which are executed to obtain the printing data. See col. 8, lines 11-20.

Examiner asserts that the command processing programs in *Kageyama* correspond to the plurality of formatters disclosed in claim 15. See Office Action, page 3, lines 14-15. However, the command processing programs interpret and execute printing commands. The command processing programs do not format data, whether the printing commands or otherwise. Therefore, *Kageyama* does not disclose a plurality of formatters to format incoming blocks of data into one or more formats. As a result, *Kageyama* fails to teach at least one limitation of claims 15 and 18. Consequently, *Kageyama* does not anticipate the invention in claims 15 and 18 for at least the reasons

set forth above. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 15 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

Claim 16 depends from claim 15. Claims 19 and 20 depend from claim 18. Because dependent claims include the limitations of the claims from which they depend, Applicant submits that claims 16, 19 and 20 are not anticipated by *Kageyama* for at least the reasons set forth above.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Rejections of Claims 1-5 and 11-14 Based on *Kageyama*

Claims 1-5 and 11-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over *Kageyama*. Claim 4 has been canceled without prejudice. Therefore, the rejection of claim 4 as being unpatentable over *Kageyama* is moot. For at least the reasons set forth below, Applicant submits that claims 1-3 and 5 are not rendered obvious by *Kageyama*.

Amended claim 1 recites the following:

providing, together with the unformatted data portions, a plurality of formatters, each of which is capable of formatting one or more of said unformatted data portions into said format; ...

According to the Examiner, the command conversion programs in *Kageyama* correspond to a plurality of formatters, each of which is capable of formatting one or more of said data portions into a format. See Office Action, page 7, lines 13-16. As explained above, *Kageyama* discloses that a print server is equipped with a command conversion program, and that program converts print commands to common commands. *Kageyama* does not disclose providing, together with unformatted data portions, a

plurality of formatters, each of which is capable of formatting one or more of said unformatted data portions into a format. As a result, *Kageyama* fails to teach at least one limitation of claim 1.

Examiner asserts that *Kageyama* does not disclose that the command processing part in *Kageyama* is implemented in software, but that *Kageyama* discloses the use of software in another context, and that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify *Kageyama* to implement the command processing part in software. See Office Action, page 8, lines 7-9 and 10-20. As explained previously, *Kageyama* fails to disclose providing, together with unformatted data portions, a plurality of formatters, each of which is capable of formatting one or more of said unformatted data portions into a format, as recited in claim 1. Consequently, regardless of whether the command processing part is implemented in software, *Kageyama* fails to teach at least one limitation of claim 1.

For at least the reasons set forth above, claim 1 is not rendered obvious by *Kageyama*. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Claims 2, 3 and 5 depend from claim 1. Because dependent claims include the limitations of the claims from which they depend, Applicant submits that claims 2, 3 and 5 are not rendered obvious by *Kageyama* for at least the reasons set forth above.

Amended claim 11 recites the following:

conversion means for converting said unformatted data portions into a format viewable to said viewer, said conversion means being separately located from said viewer; ...

According to the Examiner, the command conversion programs in *Kageyama* correspond to the conversion means in claim 11. The conversion program in *Kageyama* converts printing commands to common commands. The conversion means in claim 11, however, converts unformatted data portions into a format viewable to a viewer. *Kageyama* does not disclose a conversion means for converting unformatted data portions into a format viewable to a viewer.

Examiner asserts that *Kageyama* fails to disclose that the conversion means is separately located from the viewer, but that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify *Kageyama* to implement the command processing part so that the conversion means is separate from the viewer. See Office Action, page 12, lines 9-17. As explained previously, *Kageyama* fails to disclose a conversion means for converting unformatted data portions into a format viewable to a viewer. Consequently, regardless of whether the conversion means is separately located from a viewer, *Kageyama* fails to teach at least one limitation of claim 11.

For at least the reasons set forth above, claim 11 is not rendered obvious by *Kageyama*. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Claims 12-14 depend from claim 11. Because dependent claims include the limitations of the claims from which they depend, Applicant submits that claims 12-14 are not rendered obvious by *Kageyama* for at least the reasons set forth above.

Rejections of Claims 6-10 Based on *Kageyama* and *Nagasaki*

Claims 6-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over *Kageyama* in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,511,156 issued to *Nagasaki* (*Nagasaki*). Claim 9 has been canceled without prejudice. Therefore, the rejection of claim 9 as being unpatentable over *Kageyama* and *Nagasaki* is moot. For at least the reasons set forth below, Applicant submits that claims 6-8 and 10 are not rendered obvious by *Kageyama* in view of *Nagasaki*.

Amended claim 6 recites the following:

providing unformatted data to each of said viewers, said unformatted data including a plurality of unformatted data portions;

providing a plurality of formatters, each of which is capable of formatting one or more unformatted data portions into at least one format viewable to at least one of said viewers; ...

As explained above, *Kageyama* fails to disclose providing a plurality of formatters, each of which is capable of formatting one or more unformatted data portions into at least one format viewable to a viewer.

*Nagasaki* discloses obtaining printing picture element information from a source file described in a page-description language. See Abstract. *Nagasaki* does not disclose providing a plurality of formatters, each of which is capable of formatting one or more unformatted data portions into at least one format viewable to a viewer. Therefore, *Nagasaki* fails to cure the deficiencies of *Kageyama* identified by the Applicant. Thus, the combination of *Kageyama* and *Nagasaki* does not teach or suggest at least one limitation of claim 6. Consequently, for at least the reasons set forth above, claim 6 is not rendered obvious by *Kageyama* in view of *Nagasaki*. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Claims 7, 8 and 10 depend from claim 6. Because dependent claims include the limitations of the claims from which they depend, Applicant submits that claims 7, 8 and 10 are not rendered obvious by *Kageyama* in view of *Nagasaki* for at least the reasons set forth above.

Rejection of Claim 17 Based on *Kageyama* and *Schoenzeit*

Claim 17 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over *Kageyama* in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,619,624 issued to *Schoenzeit* et al. (*Schoenzeit*). For at least the reasons set forth below, Applicant submits that claim 17 is not rendered obvious by *Kageyama* in view of *Schoenzeit*.

As explained above, *Kageyama* fails to disclose a plurality of formatters to format incoming blocks of data into one or more formats, as recited in claim 15. Examiner states that *Kageyama* also fails to disclose the limitation set forth in claim 17, which depends from claim 15. See Office Action, page 18, lines 7-8. However, Examiner contends that *Schoenzeit* discloses the limitation set forth in claim 17, and that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine *Kageyama* and *Schoenzeit*. See Office Action, page 18, lines 9-16.

*Schoenzeit* discloses an apparatus for managing a plurality of output devices to generate images from graphic image files. See Abstract. *Schoenzeit* does not disclose a plurality of formatters to format incoming blocks of data into one or more formats, as recited in claim 15. Therefore, *Nagasaki* fails to cure the deficiencies of *Kageyama* identified by the Applicant. Thus, regardless of whether *Schoenzeit* discloses the limitation set forth in claim 17, the combination of *Kageyama* and *Schoenzeit* fails to

teach or suggest at least one limitation of claim 17. For at least the reasons set forth above, claim 17 is not rendered obvious by *Kageyama* in view of *Schoenzeit*. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claim 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER  
SEP 24 2003

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that the rejections have been overcome. Therefore, claims 1-3, 5-8 and 10-20 are in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if such contact would further the examination of the present application.

Please charge any shortages and credit any overcharges to our Deposit Account number 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,  
BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: Sept. 23, 2003

  
Joseph A. Pugh  
Attorney for Applicant  
Reg. No. 52,137

12400 Wilshire Boulevard  
Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026  
(503) 684-6200

OFFICIAL